

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-42 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 3, 21, 29, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The rejections have been overcome by amendment to the claims, taking into consideration the helpful comments of the Examiner.

Claims 1-8 and 10-42 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter in which Applicants believe is their invention.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claims 1, 6-8, 19, 24-27, 32-35, and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fontanella, Hanks, and Murray; Claims 2, 3, 5, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 31, 36, 37, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fontanella, Hanks, and Murray in view of Sullivan; and Claims 4, 22, 30, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fontanella, Hanks, and Sullivan in view of Liu.

These rejections are respectively traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Fontanella does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the driving circuit for selectively driving the piezoelectric element in either a voltage mode or charge mode in independent Claim 1, a class AB amplifier connected to receive the output from the class A amplifier to selectively provide either a current mode driving signals or voltage mode driving signals

to the piezo element in independent Claim 10, the step of selectively driving the piezo element in either the voltage mode or the charge mode in independent Claim 19, the means for selectively driving the piezo element in either a voltage mode or a charge mode in independent Claim 27 albeit defined as a driving circuit for selectively driving the piezo element in either a voltage mode or charge mode in independent Claim 35.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Fontanella does not disclose that the piezo element may be driven in a voltage mode or in a charge mode as evidence by the top of Page 3 of the Office Action.

Hanks does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the driving circuit for selectively driving the piezo element in either a voltage mode or a charge mode as defined in the various forms in independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 27, and 35.

The Examiner alleges that Hanks discloses that a piezoelectric element may be driven in a voltage mode referring to Figure 4 or the charge mode referring for Figure 5.

However, Hanks does not disclose a single circuit for selectively driving the piezoelectric in either a voltage mode or the charge mode.

The circuits of Figure 4 and Figure 5 are separate embodiments.

Additionally, whether Murray discloses avoiding unwanted energy absorption and whether one of ordinary skill in the art would consider modifying Hanks or Fontanella is of no moment since the result in construction would still in no way disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Furthermore, whether or not Sullivan discloses a circuit for adjusting an output impedance and whether or not one of ordinary skill in the art would consider modifying

Fontanella, Hanks, or Murray is of not moment since the result in construction would still in no way disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hanks, Murray, and Sullivan do not relate to mass storage devices.

Hanks relates to a control system for an airbag.

Murray relates to an admittance circuitry. While Sullivan relates to a power supply for an electrical mechanical device.

Liu does not relate to a mass storage device.

These references do not relate to a piezo element in a milli-actuator device and a mass storage device.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633